IEIJ:A New Approach To International Education in Japan

IEIJ : A New Approach To International Education In Japan

Misao MAKINO

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore the possibility of founding a new institute for international education in Japan, The International Education Institute of Japan (IEIJ). The primary purpose of the institute would be to make positive contributions to the growing international and intercultural efforts at understanding, cooperation, and constructive exchange on behalf of global stability, prosperity and quality. And the concept of quality here includes research activity, social interaction, and physical conditions of urban and rural environments.

IEIJ would join the global community in ongoing efforts to communicate about critical issues across cultural differences. It would meet the information directly and specifically by pursuing intercultural research into the nature of knowledge. In doing so, it would respond programmatically to the possibility that a source of miscommunication is cultural differences in the meanings and uses of knowledge. IEIJ would offer the global community an internationally oriented research institution with specifically Asian roots. The cultural background of IEIJ would become operational foreground in allowing pressing issues of science, education, and ethics to be stated and explored from specifically Asian perspectives. Theoretically, then, IEIJ would offer a new model of institutional organization and process which would, hopefully, bring new understandings of global issues.

To sharpen the theoretical focus of this project, I want to offer some reflections on the reasons for choosing "institute" rather than "college" or "university" in the name of the new institution. Despite some illustrious exceptions, and much energy at reform, Japan's more than 1,000 universities and colleges today function largely to sort, select, and polish young Japanese for positions in the private and public sectors. Like the mechanical tumblers of lapidaries, they do not add so much as

*Faculty of Regional Development Studies, Toyo University

they shape toward a stable image of the sarariman (salaryman), organization man, company man, or bureaucrat. Far from highpowered, high-quality research centers, most Japanese universities and colleges perform the eminently useful and necessary functions of aligning and regularizing the passage of young Japanese from youth to socially useful, productive, and stable positions in the world of work. To use the Japanese terms for university or college in the name of the new institution would therefore confuse all as to its character and intention.

Of course, a new, successful institution of international education would no doubt attract the attention of educators in Japan, and, to that extent, IEIJ would offer an example of how existing universities and colleges in Japan might be reformed. To understand more clearly, however, why my effort is going towards innovation rather than specifically towards reform from within existing institutions, a closer look at current Japanese higher education practice is necessary.

Japanese Higher Education

Broadly speaking, Japanese higher education can be divided into public and private institutions. The public institutions are controlled by the bureaucrats in the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. In private institutions control is normally exercised by a Board of Directors through a president. Members of the Board often own the university. The Chairperson of the Board, who has the most discretion in allocating resources, is often not an educator and lacks academic background. The Board sometimes selects an educator to be president of the university but more often presidents are selected on the basis of their loyalty and their ability to raise money. The differences in emphasis between traditional social values and modern academic values create interesting and difficult patterns and problems in Japan's institutions of higher education.

Private Education

An example from the sphere of private education in Japan will help to clarify this difference in values. From 1972 to 1977, I was Associate Director of International Programs and Associate Professor of English Education at Kansai University of Foreign Studies in Osaka. Kansai University specializes in English and Spanish languages and linguistics in a four year undergraduate program leading to a BA, and a graduate division that offers an MA and a PhD in linguistics. Its Osaka campus currently has about 10,000 students and about 200 professors. It is privately owned

by the Tanimoto family. It was founded after WW II by Takako Tanimoto. She is a widower who is both the president of the university and the Chairperson of the Board of Directors.

Presedent Tanimoto's hiring practice, consisted in hiring into key administrative positions in her university retired bankers from her main bank in Osaka, the Sumitomo Bank. Since her financial dealings with the bank were regular and large, and since loyalty to institutions is lifelong in Japanese society, such personnel choices amounted to an extremely uniform and smooth transmission system for her orders. Kansai University of Foreign Studies is not an exceptional case. Among the scores of private universities of this size in Japan, this kind of control by a single family or person is common. This staffing procedure does not reflect academic issues, priorities, or concerns. As a procedure, it dovetails with another hiring procedure, used by President Tanimoto and common in Japan, of hiring into faculty positions professors who have recently retired from public universities. These older people, usually 60 to 70 years of age, have already done most of their vigorous and original teaching, research, and writing. They thus help to create an educational milieu in which students do very little work, especially in comparison with US students, and still receive advanced degrees.

One may assume that institutions of higher education, private or public, exist to perform some altruistic services. However, such private institutions there show mixed motives and purposes. Some of these are the extension and increase of family name status, prestige, and social power, and gaining of profits for personal uses. Seen in terms of such purposes, President Tanimoto's hiring procedures are rational and realistic. She has already been awarded by the Japanese government one of its most prestigious medals for contributions to education and society. But she runs her organizations as though their primary purposes were not advancement of disciplinary frontiers, solution of pressing national problems, preparation of competent professionals, and education of citizens for social and political participation. At this point, the conflict between partisan social values and partisan academic values becomes especially clear and difficult for the older generation of Japanese who are leaders and owners of private universities. Although they dedicate themselves to academic excellence, they often understand the operation of their institutions in Japanese terms that do not reflect the kinds of Western institutional practices which have historically supported Western academic values. Pursuit of the social values accrues benefits to a minority of persons who lead and

control the university.

In a study of power and conflict in US universities, Baldridge presents "characteristics of colleges and universities" that reflect a view of the institution as a Weberian bureaucracy.[1] Two of the chatacteristics listed significantly differentiate US higher education institutions from private and public institutions in Japan : "1. Competence is the criterion for appointment."[2] Competence, assessed by academic criteria, is not the same as controllability as defined by administrative criteria of efficiency and consistency, or by the social criterion of loyalty. Although promotion through the ranks in Japan from assistant to lecturer, to assistant professor and to full professor requires publication and research, the other criteria just mentioned are also important. "5.The career is exclusive ; no other work is done."[3] Professors in private universities in Japan, as in the United States, can and do hold other jobs, including part-time professorial positions in other institutions.

These differences have some important consequences for relationships between professors and students in Japan's universities and colleges. Many retired professors reuse old lectures and readings with no attempt or requirement to update. Many professors in private universities and colleges teach as many as 500 students in five lecture classes that meet on two days of the week, then go to another institution to teach another 200 students. Typically, mid-term and final exams are not returned to students after grading. The students simply receive grade reports at the ends of the terms. It takes little imagination to conclude that the quality of interaction and communcation between students and professors tends to be superficial, mechanical, impersonal, uninformative, uninspiring, and unproductive.

Public Education

In the exceptional public universities, such as The University of Tokyo and The University of Kyoto, classes are smaller and professors are limited in the amount of outside teaching they can do. However, in 1985, the combined national and local public universities and colleges were only 28% of the total institutions of higher education in Japan with the other 72% under private control.[4] In 1990, the total enrollment in public universities and colleges, including national and municipal institutions, junior colleges, and graduate schools, was 685,675 with a total of 100, 898 full-time teachers of all ranks for a student teacher ratio of 7 to 1. Enrollment in private higher education institutions was 2,017,230 with a tatal of 97,635 full-time teachers of all ranks for a student ratio of 21 to 1.[5] Furthermore, for most students

in even the high prestige public universities, the goal is to gain a high position in the workplace, it is not to take part in international education or to do research. In fact, so dominant is this oriention among Japanese educators and students that otherwise well-informed observers of Japan's educational scene consistently overlook the kind of Japanese institution that serves as a theoretical model of IEIJ.

Riken: A Model For IEIJ

In 1917, the Rikagaku Kenkyujo [Institute for Physics and Chemistry] was founded by Nakamura Seiji, a professor at Tokyo Imeperial University, and Takamine Jokichi, who first discovered adrenalin in 1900. Riken, as the institute is familiarly known, "has done more to advance creative research than any other single organization in modern Japanese history."[6] Under the eventual direction of Okochi Masatoshi, Riken brought a new spirit of creative research to Japanese industry and, after the appointment of the brilliant Japanese physicist, Yoshio Nishina, as section chief in 1928, became the breeding grounds for almost all of the pioneering work done in physics in modern Japan. Kazuyuki Kitamura, in a recent overview of the past, present, and future of Japanese higher education, provides an historical and statistical description of a great variety of Japanese educational institutions but does not mention Riken or the kind of institution it represents in modern Japanese educational history.[7] I will discuss Riken in more detail in connection with the description of the possible organization of IEIJ; for now, I want to use it to distinguish clearly the theoretical orientation of IEIJ from other educational institutions and efforts in Japan.

The exclusive focus on the real or presumed relation between Japan's modern educational system and its economic growth since World War II is shared by non-Japanese commentators as well. In the first part of an extended study of Japan's modern educational system, Japan is introduced as the most advanced nation of East Asia "in technology, in commerce and industrialization, in standard of living, and in educational opportunity." R.Murray Thomas, the author of the first part of the study, quotes Article 1 of the Fundamental Education Law of 1947: "Education shall aim at the full development of personality, at rearing a people, sound in mind and body, who love truth and justice, esteem individual values, respect labor, have a deep sense of responsibility, and are imbued with an independent spirit as builders of a peaceful state and society."[8] An international education institute is clearly in line with the prescriptions of this law but Thomas does not

mention Riken in his historical survey of Japanese education nor does he emphasize the research that has allowed Japan to gain such a prominent position in East Asia.

In the second part of this study, written by five Japanese educators, the focus is again on the relation between the educational system and Japan's economic and political conditions. At the end of their last section, "Prospects for the Future," the authors state that it is "clear that the further internationalization of Japanese society the building of an increasing number of economic, political, and cultural bridges with the rest of the world--is an indispensable requisite for the country's future prosperity. Such an international perspective must permeate the nation's schooling efforts as well."[9] Kitamura also includes in his conclusion an assertion that "from 1990 to 2000 Japanese higher education is expected to face more fundamental structural changes." Among these he cites as one of the most important "external pressures" the continuing internationalization of Japanese society.[10] If higher education is viewed as primarily a domestic process of preparing Japanese for Japan' s work world, then internationalization can be considered an external pressure. However, the science practiced in Japan before and after the founding of Riken was not simply a domestic process. It was an international effort from the beginning and it is with this effort that IEIJ theoretically connects.

IEIJ : A Model For Advancing Knowledge

Theoretically, therefore, where other commentators and planners of Japanese education end, with internationalization, is where IEIJ begins. Riken was small in scale, with no internal departmental organization, and devoted not to social purposes but to the advancement of knowledge in particular scientific disciplines. IEIJ would follow this format in all but the last point where it would pursue issues of particular importance in international education. Such a pursuit would logically and naturally connect IEIJ as a center for research with world efforts to establish orderly processes of communication, cooperation, and education that transcend local concerns. IEIJ would thus further connect with the universality ideal of the university and the collegial ideal of the college. But it would do so in a way that included in its community all of the peoples of the world and any of their representatives who were interested in and qualified in IEIJ's research projects.

In more practical terms, IEIJ would realize its primary purpose through two major activities : 1. The preparation of international students for higher education in host cultures, with two-way programs for native speakers of Japanese, English,

and Mandarin Chinese. Included in this activity would be cultural preparation. This aspect would involve improving students active knowledge of their home cultures, giving them intensive training in the skills of discussion, listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and academic writing, and solid content acquisition of information about many aspects of their future host culture.

2. Interdisciplinary research into issues of international and intercultural education. This research would be centered in and grounded by the effort to produce globally relevant and realistic presentations of IEIJ's core values: stability, prosperity, and quality. Radiating from this center would be concerns about education and cultural and cultural change, education and intercultural contact, education and international political issues of peace and justice, education and international economic, environmental, and social issues, etc. IEIJ's division of cultural preparation would serve not only its students and staff but also the needs of institute researchers for a research site. There would thus be ongoing dialogic and dialectic relations between theory and practice, and theoreticians and practitioners, with opportunities for everyone on the staffs of both divisions to change, mix, and merge roles.

The timeframe of founding the institute would involve two simultaneous negotiations. One would be with backers in Japan for the establishment of the initial site. The other would be with educators from ROC, PRC, PDRK, Malaysia, Singapore, and the USA. The second set of negotiations would have as their eventual aim the establishment of joint-venture, satellite institutes in each of those countries. The initial site would serve the entire project by providing a concrete, operational example of the realization of the institute's ideals.

For the purposes of this paper, I am going to take it as granted that an adequate marker of students exists to support an IEIJ with satellites, and that an adequate supply of trained, experienced, professional personnel exists to staff it. Even with these realistic assumptions, though, many further questions obviously need to be answered and many further problems solved. To that end, I will deal, in the remainder of this paper, with the following crucial problem areas for IEIJ: Organization of Internal Relations; Processes of Training, Preparation, and Research; Procurement And Stabilization of Financial Resources.

Organization of Social Relations

In this section I am going to sketch out some possible, desirable, and necessary

arrangements for the three main organizational sections of IEIJ : Administrtion ; Research in International and Intercultural Education; and, Linguistic Training and Culture Preparation.

Administration

As conceived so far, the over-all administrarive organization of IEIJ would be simple and traditional. Executive positions would include a President, with duties and responsibilities for Personnel, Budget, and Facilities. There would also be a Vice-President with duties and responsilities for Research, Training, and Evaluation. There would be two Directors, one for Recruitment and Counseling and another for Promotion, Advertising, and External Affairs. The Vice-President would serve as the Director of the Research division of IEIJ and would work closely with the Directors of the three language and culture divisions, the Director of Japanese, the Director of English, and the Director of Chinese. The initial complement of regular language and culture preparation teachers would be three in each division. Their immediate supervisors would be the Directors of their respective divisions. With a proposed maximum ratio of 20 students to 1 instructor, IEIJ would thus attempt to open with 9 regular teachers and 180 students in place. This kind of consideration, while sounding somewhat artificial on paper, is of utmost importance for initial planning, and site selection.

To service a truly international community of students, such an operation would have to provide residence facilities for some number of paying students whose fees would meet in a regular and predictable way some of the expenses of the entire institution. Residence facilities of course require land and thus make a further demand on the consideration of location. The price per tsubo--the size of two traditional tatami mats--of land decreases the further you get from Tokyo and the further you get from any settled municipality. But a careful calculation will have to be made to balance the income from residential students with operating expenses in such a way as to set a desirable minimum of such students; this minimum would then place a parameter on desirable which would in turn govern selection of location.

Beyond facilities for administrative offeces, student and staff residences, and research activities, would be those for the various language teaching and cultural preparation activities that would constitute the core of the students' formal lives at IEIJ. The precise shape of such teaching-learning spaces would be developed with

the experienced professionals who would eventually staff IEIJ. In general, though, the goal of administration at IEIJ would be to remain as invisible as possible in routine support functions and as visible as possible in educational leadership functions. Such an aim argues for modest facilities for administration with the bulk of funding and energy going into research and teaching/preparation areas.

Research in International and Intercultural Education

Although the last section discussed the overall supporting organization of IEIJ, it is important to distinguish the proposed institution internally according to its different functions. The area of research is an especially difficult one to administer as the history in the changes of research organizations in the USA since the Sputnik crisis has clearly shown.[11] Japan has been very fortunate in being able to draw upon the experience of Western culture, especially that of the United States and the Soviet Union in scientific research, in designing some of her own research institutions.

Of singular importance for understanding one of those institutions, Riken, and its importance for the design of IEIJ is the fact that Yoshio Nishina, one of the designers of Riken's format, had worked in the Copenhagen physics research institute under the great Danish physicist, teacher, and researcher, Neils Bohr. Nishina brought with him a spirit that coincided with that of the founders of Riken and allowed it to bloom even though the educational institutions around it, for the most part, ignored its example. There were several concrete aspects in the organization of Riken that can be clearly stated, easily understood, and then used as a blueprint for the research section of IEIJ.

The first and perhaps the most important is the absence of any chair or department system. By design, no one is allowed to disappear into institutionally enforced isolation, into narrowness of concern and research, or into negativity about "outside" colleagues. No bureaucratic structure of inside and outside is allowed to develop. There are no chair positions, there are not departments for anyone to head, and there are no pyramids to the top of which lesser people may scramble at the expense of good research. Second, all of the facilities at Riken were used in common by all the members of the institute. Skills of cooperation, interdependence, and sharing were thus fostered at a very basic physical and economic level.

Third, basing his approach on his experience at the Copenhagen institute, Nishina instituted weekly meetings at which all researchers share information, ideas,

and work in progress. It is important, I think, in understanding and applying this characteristic, not to fall into the error of doctrinaire Marxism, which is now, in the Soviet Union and Mainland China, both showing its negative limitations and loosening around the Western ideas of initiative and personal enterprise, by taking an absolutist stand on individual cooperation in such regular meetings. The opportunity must be provided by the organizational structure and then the overall administrators must back off and let the research staff use the opportunity as they best see it. Fourth, there was no effort to calculate equal units of deservingness on the basis of which available funds were allocated to everyone equally. Money was "flexibly allotted to allow for emphasis on specific research projects."[12] This characteristic of Riken and of the future IEIJ makes very clear the requirement that the people who do research there have a rather different set of personal values than usually encountered among professionals in established educational institutions.

The fifth characteristic of Riken was the privileging of basic scientific research over application. This would be a tricky one for IEIJ because it does not position itself as a center for research in established theoretical disciplines with defined lines of work. It would also be tricky because, as an educational research center, IEIJ would inevitably be involved in ethical, political, and cultural issues. It would be of great interest to eventually see in what way a financially solvent, international group of experienced workers in intercultural and international education would define their research program.

The sixth characteristic of Riken had to do with a mind-set that favored creative work "by its tolerant and expectant attitude toward any new ideas that arose in the course of study." This kind of atmosphere is definitely not suited for the large majority of academics who are content to carve out a little niche and then vagetate in it for thirty years until they can retire and go fishing. The stagnation of Japanese culture in the existing universities and colleges is too well-known to need rehearsing here.[13] Suffice it to comment that, even with its proven success as an educational organization in Japan, the tradition of Riken is still by far the minority tradition in Japanese educational organization and conduct.[14] As commented in the Introduction, most Japanese universities and colleges have nothing to do with knowledge or research ; they are highly effective and necessary sorting processes for a mass and massively organized society. I feel very fortunate, therefore, that Riken suggests the best of Western culture in educational organization in Japanese terms, on Japanese soil, and with a Japanese history that clearly demonstrates the universal applicabil-

ity and strength of the basic organization.

The seventh characteristic of Riken that offers a model for the research division of IEIJ was "the absence of cliquism that is so firmly rooted in Japanese universities."[15] Following clearly from the absence of chairs, departments, or academically privileging financial arrangements, this absence is remarkable and unusual. At the opening of the Yamada Language Center at the University of Oregon, in April, 1991, professors of many different languages from the university's language and culture area departments expressed gratitude for the opportunity to sit down and talk with colleagues whom they otherwise never met. The Chairperson of one Romance language department called the experience at the opening "fantastic," because even in the culturally related Romance language departments the professors simply do not talk with each other. This same kind of isolation is typical of Japanese universities and colleges. The plan at IEIJ would not be to make pious statements about the desirability of interdisciplinary work ; it would be to prevent isolation from the beginning by adopting the strategies and arrangements of the Riken institute.

Linguictic Training and Culture Preparation

As was previously mentioned, the initial conception of IEIJ as a language and culture training center involves three distinct divisions servicing native speakers of Japanese, English, and Mandarin who want to prepare to study in one of the other two language areas. It would help native Japanese speakers prepare to go to the USA or to a Chinese language society ; it would help native Chinese speakers to learn enough of Japanese to function at their desired levels of effectiveness in Japanese society. It would also help both Japanese and Chinese native speakers who wanted to go to an English speaking country, especially the USA, for study in institutions of higher education. And, it would service English speakers who desired to study in either Japanese or Chinese societies.

It is already clear from the experience of the hundreds of preparatory and language training schools in existence that the population of such institutions, especially in basic language and culture preparation courses, quickly becomes much more heterogeneous than just stated. No doubt IEIJ would have businesspeople, travelers, diplomats, and fine artists among our students along with the mainstream of younger people who would be seeking an international education experience in another culture. At this basic level, the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies offers

a model residential pattern for IEIJ, where students of a new language should live with native speakers in a language house/immersion arrangement. This format has proven as effective for language and culture preparation as the Riken format has for scientific research.

In more methodolgical terms, the strengths and weaknesses of the grammar-translation, audio-lingual, and communicative competence approaches to second language teaching are well-known.[16] It seems likely that the overall administrators of IEIJ would leave most of the decisions about method up to the language division directors and to their subordinate teachers and their students. The core curriculum of IEIJ would certainly resemble that of established institutions with similar goals, such as the American English Institute at the University of Oregon.[17] Another existing reference point is, The International Division of Waseda University in Tokyo that has been in existence for twenty years.[18] The inclusion of a research division in IEIJ along with other processes to be discussed below, however, would require some strong differences from such institutions. Much of this cannot be specified in advance. But some sense of method in relation to facility would have to be generated. The most reasonable approach would have the facilities flexible enough to provide for at least three different kinds of indoor teacher-student relations: one to one; one to small group; and one to large group, or assembly. By fixing the most desirable number of start-up teachers and students, as suggested above, and using up-to-date on optimum teaching space from such organizations as the MIFS and Berlitz, a rough though usable approximation of initial facility space could obtained.

Judging from research on Japanese student success and failure in US higher education institutions, the existing language and culture preparatory schools in Japan promise far more than they deliver. Students with inadequate conversational skills, even after nine years of public school instruction in English and additional months of years of intensive instruction in private institutions, and with inadequate knowledge of either their own or American culture, are commonplace. Gebz' suggested manual for use in the US to develop conversational management techniques in Japanese students was based solidly on this observation.[19] Neide-Knox suggests further that, not only should intensive English conversation classes be available in the US for Japanese students, but also cultural preparation of Japanese students should be greatly increased and improved.[20] And Takasue, in an article about preparatory schools in Japan for Japanese students bound for higher educa-

tion campuses in the US, discusses schools run by Americans with curriculums in English. Because of practices in such schools as promising American instructors and then using either Japanese instructors or transient American travellers to give English instruction, the likelihood of the Japanese students' realizing dreams of going to a US campus is "very slim."[21] It seems obvious that if language and culture preparatory schools in Japan were doing their jobs properly, then these kinds of suggestions and observations would be unnecessary. It seems clear that IEIJ cannot merely adopt existing language teaching methods; the need to develop some of its own is one of the main reasons for having a research section in IEIJ.

Processes of Training, Preparation, and Research

I want to begin this section by reemphasizing the point that the language and culture preparation division of IEIJ would be there partly because it could serve the reaearch interests of the research division. In other words, traditional isolation would be designed out of IEIJ from the beginning in its research division, but so would the traditional isolation between theoretical and practical or applied areas. Students, teachers, and staff will know from the beginning that they are studying, teaching, or working in a whole institution that is as devoted to research as it is to practical results. The processes of training and preparation will thus be carried on much in the spirit of the demonstration schools that are sometimes attached to Teacher Education institutions in the United States. There would be an ongoing dialogue between teachers and researchers on behalf of not only the effectiveness of the teachers but also of the theoretical aims of the researchers.

IEIJ would defintely not exclude students from this dialogue but their part in it would be quite different. More than course evaluations, IEIJ would actively encourage students to return to share with us their experiences at their destinations in their host cultures. IEIJ's faculty would be especially interested in their success or failure in the institutions of higher education for which it would be specifically preparing most of our students. At this point, faculty would ask former students to become informants or subjects for the researchers of IEIJ who would then turn the information gained both to the purpose of improving the operation of the language and culture preparation division and to use in the ongoing exploration of international and intercultural educational issues.

The motivation for such an effort toward new culture preparation techniques comes from my discussions with young Japanese here who have suffered double

culture shock. The first shock was how different Americans in America are than on the screen or in person in Japan. The second was how little the Japanese students knew about their own culture. Students here have repeatedly emphasized the importance of Japanese learning and knowing more about their own culture before they come to the US. There is, furthermore, a third culture shock that no one seems to have studied yet but that is clear to me as an international educator who has had the opportunity to work with Japanese students on both sides of the Pacific. This is the shock to a person who returns to Japan after spending enough time in the US to have picked up and learned how to practice some of its individualistic, assertive, and achievement-oriented morality. Some Japanese students in the US seem to flourish in this new moral atmosphere and to become much stronger personalities. But when they return to Japan, where social structure is vertical and highly consensual, they experience the shock of being between two worlds.[22] My personal experience in this regard began after I returned to Japan from a four-year stay in the US. When I became a professor in Japan, my colleagues told me that I looked, thought, and acted like a Nisei even though, while I was in America, I felt my difference, my Japaneseness, very strongly. This phenomenon deserves study cross-culturally on the hypothesis that it would occur with students from any home culture going to another culture and then back to home culture. This deficiency in the preparation of even very intelligent Japanese students, not to mention students from other cultures as well, would certainly the staff of IEIJ.

In terms of a marketable process, IEIJ staff would be looking at developing a reintegration process by means of which Japanese students especially, in the initial location in Japan, could work within IEIJ to return to their home culture. There would be many challenging dimensions to such a process. Possibly the most important would be to help such young people to clearly and honestly understand the strengths and weaknesses of both of their cultures, Japan's and, for example, America's. IEIJ would thus become involved in the actual internationalization process not only of Japan but also of other cultures. Such an involvement would unquestionably bring up many difficult and interesting political, ethical, and social issues. The existence of a research division would provide and sustain the institutional environment needed to deal with such issues in the careful, dispassionate way necessary for good scholarship and good science. This reflection underlines the desirability of combining preparation and research. IEIJ would work to prevent itself from becoming just another political pawn in the internatinal political game

and the work would center on the quality not simply of preparation but especially of research there.

The concept of reintegration, though, includes more than making connections between students and cultures. It also involves helping international students, that is, students from any culture who study for some length of time in another culture, to integrate their international education with the rest of their education. Richard D. Lambert considers such lack of integration to be one of the major problems globally in international education. He asserts that one of the major challenges for internationally oriented educators is find ways to help students "relate the experience the student gains abroad more effectively to the rest of his or her education." He relates studies of the transcripts of graduating seniors that show how international education gets isolated and is "too often a totally enclaved educational experience." He attributes part of the cause of this isolation to departments that consider study abroad to be none of their business. Again, as in designing the research division of IEIJ, the departmental system appears as a negative force in educational institutions. I agree with Lambert that the task of integrating international education into the rest of the curriculum is only "secondarily a question of financial resources."[23] The major problem has to do with the attitudes of narrowness and isolation that are institutionalized in so many ways in both American and Japanese universities and colleges.

It seems clear to me that international education is and must be interdisciplinary education if only minimally because at least two languages and two cultures are involved. Once there are two of each, no one from either culture can assume that they really understand the other person. Therefore, the disciplines of comparative anthropology, comparative linguistics, and second-language learning become necessary for cross-cultural cooperative work. If we add to this minimum, professional specializations in such areas as education, sociology, history, etc., international work becomes thoroughly and richly interdisciplinary. The idea that such work can or should be carried on in one language simply amounts to placing value priority on the point of view of the culture in which that privileged language is indigenous. The only language, if it may be so called, that can escape this ethnocentrism is mathematics. But mathematics must continually be interpreted to be used and the interpretations must go on in natural languages. Again, international work becomes multi-lingual and interdisciplinary.

Additional IEIJ Processes

Two further processes are worth mentioning here because they should become regular parts of IEIJ's format and because they follow rather naturally from the foregoing discussion. These are contractual consulting with other agencies and institutions and the training and preparation of professionals who work as consultants in cultures relevant to IEIJ's program. There seems to be an international community of such consultants and hence an existing market for highly refined and specialized training. Obviously, IEIJ's capacity to deliver in either of these areas would depend directly on the quality and quantity of its staff.

Also, one of the specific processes IEIJ educators should explore is international tours of different countries. Such a tour would comprise native speakers of Japanese, English, and Chinese going in a group together on an itinerary of other countries, such as Pacific Rim, European, Latin American, or African. The idea of this process would be to involve people in a multidimensional intercultural experience in which they would not only be dealing with members of other cultures in host situations but also in their traveling affinity group. Although such an experience would certainly be beyond the financial ability of most students, even such brief trips as to rural Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Mainland China, Thailand, Hong Kong, etc. would bring the students into contact with people from differing cultures in two very important ways. One would involve learning how to be a guest in the culture of another language or culture area. The other would involve being able to observe people from other cultures going through the same process. A travelling affinity group would present a very rich, complicated experience of intercultural contact and exchange whose actual learning value remains to be seen. This is one of the processes that would certainly have to be designed cooperatively by teachers and researchers and then negotiated with students.

The most obvious value of the above process is like teaching young children about fish and then taking them to an aquarium, or to a river with fish, or on a fishing trip. But some less obvious values might be an acceleration in language skills and a sensitization to cultural differences beyond those of different languages. And this is part of the double culture shock that Japanese students experience. When they have commented on how different Americans in America are than in Japan, they have not been focusing on their use of English. The American culture that was only there in Japan in a few representatives is all around them in the US

and most of it is not language. International student tours might be a way of integrating that firsthand experience into a very powerful but not so personally overwhelming pattern of sustained learning.

IEIJ's Role In Advancing Knowledge

Besides exploring the processes of language and culture preparation that would be part of the institution's main menu, it would be interesting, I think, to encourage IEIJ researchers should be encouraged to explore the meaning of knowledge inter-culturally. The idea that we construct knowledge, for example, is still novel for Japanese and difficult to understand. There is no phrase in current Japanese that can translate the English "construction of knowledge" or "production of knowlege," In Japanese, we learn and study knowledge, we do not construct or produce it. In Japanese, "chishiki" means to know, in the sense of being aware of something. To understand a field as and expert and to be an expert is indicated by the word "seitsu." The English word "science" comes into Japanese as "kagaku." As far as I know, there is no sense in any of these words of knowing as a productive or constructive activity.

Perhaps I can illustrate with the earlier example of adrenalin. As I understand Takamine's work, he did not make, or build, or produce something that wasn't there before ; he discovered something, adrenalin, that had been there in the human body and that no one before had picked out and identified. I understand Kitasato's discovery of the tetanus bacillus in the same way. The tetanus vaccine work on all human beings regardless of the fact that the knowledge was first brought to light by a native of Japan. The knowledge that came out of those discoveries was certainly first stated in Japanese, and in the very technical Japanese of physical science with mathematics and other kinds of symbols. But the language wasn't the adrenalin any more than the language was the tetanus bacillus. Perhaps I world understand if someone insisted that the languages or symbolic systems used by different cultures are "constructed" or "produced," but the argument that knowledge is constructed or produced is extremely difficult for Japanese to understnd.

Research thus means to find something out, to discover something, to know something afrer a process of disciplined inquiry, that wasn't know before. Kitasato and Takamine brought something into world culture that was not there before. They discovered something that had reality beyond the limits of their language or their culture, something that any competent scientific researcher, regardless of his or

her place of birth, can verify. In my own field, I think there are similar realities. The residence/immersion system at the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies seems to me to be unquestionably the most effective way for non-native speakers to learn a new language and much of the culture that goes with it. I think this is a universal finding, like adrenalin and tetanus. It works for all people with any language or culture that is not theirs by birth. And if someone questions the method, they can certainly compare competencies, learning rates, adaptive success and failure, etc. among students of different methods. The fact that I included one-to-one instructional space in the sketch of language facilities above shows that there are exceptions, just as there are people with very little adrenalin and people with a great deal and just as some people die very quickly from tetanus infection and some hardly get ill at all. But to make all of the instructional space one-to-one would be as foolish, I think, for IEIJ's purposes, as to advertise the safety of tetanus on the basis of those few exceptions.

The focus of IEIJ would include intercultural and interdisciplinary explorations of the nature of knowledge. I think that a great many of our world problems are problems of communication, and even problems that come up between people who claim they know things that the other people don't even think are knowledge. An international, interdisciplinary effort to explore, understand, and express the meanings of knowledge would seem to me to be a worthy effort and a worthy project for research. I will only note in passing that this kind of program makes the selection of appropriate personnel, especially the executive administrators, division heads, and the first group of teachers extremely important and, in many ways, more difficult than in a conventional institution. I don't think there is any way to avoid this difficulty without fatally compromising the values and goals of IEIJ as so far envisioned.

The most important value for the researchers at Riken and at the Copenhagen Institute was the pursuit of truth within the limits of certain scientific disciplines. At IEIJ, this value would have to be defined in terms of dissolving disciplinary barriers and allowing disciplines to meet and cooperate through their representatives. The research at IEIJ would be, as mentioned before, guided and centered in the core values of the institution : stability, prosperity, and quality. The effort of the research activity at IEIJ would be, in a minimum sense, to find ways to express, represent, and share those values through the entire range of global activities. The more specific--and maximal--definitions of the content of such research activity must

await the meeting together of those who would eventually be the researchers.

Procurement And Stabilization of Financial Resources.

The financial needs of IEIJ can be roughly divided into the need for start-up capital and the need for regular, long-term income to meet normal operating expenses. As will be seen below, most of the existing funding sources in Japan favor funding existing institutions, regardless of how promising a project might look on paper. Those that do fund new projects submit their proposals to very rigorous scrutiny. The following brief tour through funding possibilities for IEIJ will therefore distinguish as appropriate those sources that might provide for IEIJ's first need, seed capital, and those that might provide for its second. Of course, it is to be understood throughout that IEIJ would charge users for its services and therefore should become as self-sufficient as possible over the long run.

The first potential source for IEIJ funds is the national government of Japan. Although the official principle in Japan is for private educational institutions of all kinds to be self-supporting, a series of educational reforms in Japan over the last twenty or so years has made an increasing amount of tax-derived public monies available to private educational institutions.[24] Various kinds of subsidies are granted by the state through its own organ of the Japan Private School Promotion Foundation. Those subsidies, however, are not for start-up or construction of original facilities. They are targeted to help private institutions "to deal with their current expenses, mainly in order to maintain and improve their educational conditions and alleviate the financial burden on students."[25] Best current estimates place the total of private educational institution expenses defrayed by these subsidies at 17% with the remainder self-financed from student fees, voluntary contributions, and activity income. The last category includes private enterprise such as training, consulting, lecturing, and publishing. Besides grants and subsidies, the national government also has a long-term low-interest loan program for improving facilities and equipment.

Besides the national government through the Ministry of Education's support of the Japan Private School Promotion Foundation, local prefectural and municipal governments are also potential sources of in-kind aid such as land and buildings and money for start-up salaries, supplies, advertising, etc. These public funds and aid would be available over and above what could be obtained from national government sources and would express and make concrete the commitment to and valuing

of the IEIJ project by its local community.

The next step in possible procurement planning is actually a half-step because it takes us to the Japan Foundation. The Japan Foundation is a half-public, half-private institution, staffed by government and private sector personnel, and giving grants to institutions and individuals.[26] By 1986, Japan had formal cultural exchange agreements with 34 countries. Many governmental intercultural activities are conducted through the Japan Foundation which, in 1986, had a budget of approximately 5.3 billion yen. Among its many purposes are granting scholarships to foreign students to study in Japan and aiding scientific exchange programs. The Japan Foundation could thus be of help in periodically providing scholarships for students or staff from abroad to come to IEIJ, although it is highly doubtful that it would provide start-up money.

The next step in this section takes us to a large number of private foundations begun, owned, and operated by successful businesspeople. Reflecting and specialized by the interests of their founders, these foundations give money in a variety of ways to people, causes, and purposes that agree with their interests. Most major, big businesses, such as Mitsubishi and Sasagawa, have their own foundations specifically oriented to education and social welfare. Their normal procedure for granting money consists two parts in which they closely scrutinize a proposal. First they determine the value of the proposed project on parameters of social and professional worth. Then they determine the uniqueness of the project by extensive comparisons with existing institutions and programs. If a project passes both parts it is very likely to receive funding from such a foundation.

However, the single most difficult fund procurement problem for IEIJ will be, as mentioned before, and depending on eventual choice and configuration of location, finding adequate start-up capital to insure a first-time, first-class entry of IEIJ into the highly competitive educational market of Japan. This profile of possible funding sources in Japan, including a fifth category to be mentioned below, mirrors the findings of surveys of financial resources for international education programs in the US.[27] However, none of the funding sources mentioned so far in Japan--government, public/private, or private--normally provides such seed capital. It is therefore necessary to take another step here to connect with those parties in contemporary Japanese society who might, because of a felicitous concurrence of wealth and educational interests, be able and willing to help IEIJ move from paper to operation. These parties are all private persons whose profile makes it very

likely that they would help such a project, if approached in the proper manner. But nothing in Japan in the sphere of financing new endeavors happens automatically. Hence the need to project a waiting and negotiation period during which it would be necessary move through the traditional Japanese channels to procure and stabilze initial funding for IEIJ.

A fifth category of possible funds should be mentioned not only for the sake of completeness but also because doing so helps to show more clearly how IEIJ might actually operate in the future. This category is joint-venture arrangements with existing educational institutions both inside and outside of Japan. Inside Japan, many existing universities and colleges have no research facilities, centers, or institutes but their leaders want them if only to enhance the status of the existing institutions. In fact, as recently as 1990, the Ministry of Education published up-to date survey data indicating that of the total research institutes in Japan, 14,761 are owned and operated by private business companies, 1,396 of them are free-standing institutes without company or university connection, and 2,146 of them are parts of universities and colleges.[28] This information, reflecting long-range trends in Japan's post-war educational development, further supports the position taken above on the choice of "institute" for the name of the new instituties and colleges are simply not dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge or the discovery of new truths. They are highly efficient and entrenched social processes for sorting and selecting. But their owners, supporters, and leaders are also very much aware of the benefits of association with a first-class research organization. The potential for a mutually enhancing relation between a beginning IEIJ and an existing college or university is therefore possible and worth pursuing.

Outside Japan are literally tens of thousands of institutions with already functioning programs in language teaching, cultural preparation, and a multitude of specializations in research on intercultural and international issues. It is certainly possible, and a prospect worthy of pursuit, that one or more of those institutions would look favorably, in exchange for a long-term agreement of cooperative exchange and support, on sharing the birthpangs of IEIJ in Japan.

It should be clear that dreaming a new international education institution in Japan is not a hopeless proposition in terms of possible funding sources. It should also be clear that such an institution would make use of the intensification of rhetoric around the internationalization of Japan's education and culture throughout official and unofficial circles during the last few decades.[29] Mombusho, the

Japan Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture, has made this point more extensively. They state that,

Kokusaika no shinten ni ohjita Gakko Kyoiku no yakuwari o kangaeta baai, mottomo juyoo na koto wa Kokusai shakai no naka de shinrai sareru nihonjin o ikusei suru koto dearu. Sono tameni wa, Kokusaiteki na Shogoizon kankei no juyoosei to tomoni, shogaikoku no bunka ya sorezore no tachiba o rikai sase, awasete wagakuni no bunka ya dento o taisetsu ni suru taido o mini tsukesaseru koto ga juyoo de aru.[30)]

[As far as we are concerned about the role of education in the development of internationalization in Japan, the most important thing for us is to educate Japanese to trust people in international sociey. The most crucial aspect for this purpose is international, mutual interdependence and, at the same time, we should endeavor to understand the cultures and positions of other countries. Of no less importance is the effort to understand our own traditional culture.]

An institution such as IEIJ, with the developing official and unofficial international awareness of Japan's own people, would also meet in a constructive way the aspiration of those non Japanese who wish to learn more, in person, about the land of the rising sun.

The International Education Institute of Japan, IEIJ, would begin on Japanese soil with two divisions of language learning and culture preparation, and research in international and intercultural education. It would try to expand to have satellite affiliates in other countries and to have more and more internal processes to service the growing international community of scholars, businesspeople, artists, travelers, and politicians.

Conclusion

Without attempting to be too specific prematurely, I have tried to show ways in which this institution would be innovative in the current Japanese educational system. Mombusho, for example, concentrates most of its educational energy on the K-12 system in Japan, and rightly so. But at the same time, more and more young Japanese are going abroad, receiving international experience, and then returning to Japan to find not only a changed culture but also changes in themselves that make reintegration difficult. Focusing on this phenomenon and providing

processes for its amelioration would be a pioneering move on the part of IEIJ. Besides this aspect of the future institution, the inclusion of a first-class research division would set IEIJ apart from almost all existing language training and culture preparation institutions in Japan, not to mention in other countries. By faithfully following the highly successful Riken/Copenhagen model, this division could become one of the world's top research institutes on intercultural and international educational issues.

The need for such an institution with specifically Asian rather than European roots can be seen, in an exemplary way, through the discussion of the nature of knowledge. Asian language and culture thinks the world's major issues ways that are sometimes fundamentally different than those of any other language and culture area. For research on intercultural and international issues to be truly intercultural and international therefore requires connections with the basic understandings of all the world's cultures. It can simply no longer be maintained that science and knowledge are a Western invention that other nations can only copy but cannot themselves, from their own cultural resouces, originate. Nor can it be maintained that the social, political, environmental, and economic issues of the world can only be accurately stated, conceptualized, and resolved in Western European languages or in terms of Western European traditions. But Asian nations, and especially Japan, cannot provide an alternative without building and maintaining new educational institutions in its own milieu. IEIJ would continue the great tradition of Riken and innovate in the field of international and intercultural education.

I have also tried to show, in this paper, that realistic funding possibilities exist for such an institution in many different national and international directions. I have also presented sketches of organization for the three main components of the institution--administration, research, and preparation. Finally, I have tried to give a little more depth and content to some of the considerations of preparation process and research.

References

1) J.Victor Baldridge, *Power And Conflict in The University : Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations* (New York : John Wiley & Sons, 1971) pp.9-11.
2) Ibid., p.10.
3) Ibid.
4) U.S.Department of Education, *Japanese Education Today* (Washington, D.C. : U.S.Govern-

ment Printing Office), p.77.
5) Mombusho [Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture] , *Waga Kuni Bunkyo Shisaku* [White paper or Japan's Educational Policies] (Tokyo : Mombusho, 1990), pp.602-5.
6) Nagai Michio, *Higher Education in Japan : Its Take-off and Crash,* trans. Jerry Dusenbury (Tokyo : University of Tokyo Press, 1971), p.69.
7) Kazuyuki Kitamura, "Japan," *International Higher Education An Encyclopedia Vol.* 1 (New York & London : Garland Publishing Inc., 1991), pp 489-498.
8) R.Murray Thomas and T.Neville Postlethwaite, *Schooling in East Asia : Forces of Change* (New York : Pergamon Press, 1983), p.57.
9) Ibid., p.84.
10) Kitamura, "Japan" , p.498.
11) Gareth Morgan, *Images Of Organization* (Newbury Park, CA : SAGE Publications, 1986), pp.321-337.
12) Ibid., p.70.
13) Teruhisa Horio, *Educational Thought and Ideology in Modern Japan : State Authority and Intellectual Freedom* (Toko : University of Toky Press, 1989), pp.3-18.
14) Ibid., p.71.
15) Ibid.
16) Misao Makino, *Teaching English As A Second Language* (Tokyo : Kobunsha Publishing Co., 1985), pp.13-21.
17) American English Institute, *American English Institute* (Eugene : University of Oregon, 1991).
18) Waseda University, *Guide To One-Year Study Abroad Program For Undergraduate Students : The Intenational Division Waseda University Tokyo* (Tokyo : Waseda University, 1990).
19) Helen Joyce Genz, "A Systematic Instructional Program For Developing Conversation Management Techniques in Japanese Students Learning English As A Second Language In The United States," unpublished Master's thesis, University of South Alabama, 1989.
20) Joan Livingston Neide-Knox, "A Study Of The Short Of Japanese Foreign Students At The University of Massachusetts, Amherst," unpublished Doctor of Education thesis, University of Massachusetts, 1988.
21) Takahiro Takesue, "U.S.Image Lures Students," Journal of Japanese Trade & Industry 6 (1990) : p.22.
22) Chie Nakane, *Japanese Society* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 1970), pp.23-46. This short book is probably still the best single introduction in English to the enduring differences betveen Japanese and American sociery. But of special interest to students of international relations are the detailed comparisons Nakane makes between Japanese society and Chinese and Indian societies.
23) Richard D.Lambert, *International Studies and the Undergraduate* (Washington, D.C. : American Council on Education, 1989), pp.161-162.
24) Leonard James Schoppa, *Education Reform in Japan : A Case of Immobilist Politics* (New York : Routledge, 1991), pp.192-4.
25) Japan Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture, *Education in Japan, 1989 : A Graphic Presentation* (Tokyo : Gyosei Publications, 1989), pp.43, 50.
26) Nippon Steel Human Resources Development Co., Ltd., *Nippon : The Land And Its People*

(Tokyo : Nippon Steel Human Resources Development Co., Ltd., 1988), p.72.

27) Richard D.Lambert, *International Studies and the Undergraduate,* p.136.

28) Mombusho, *Waga Kuni no Bunkyo Shisaku,* p.624.

29) Leonard James Schoppa, *Education Reform in Japan,* pp.5-6, 239-40 ; Edwin O, Reischauer, *The Japanese Today : Change and Continuity* (Cambridge, MA : The Belknap Press, 1988), pp.347-412.

30) Mombusho, *Waga Kuni no Bunkyo Shisaku,* p.524.